

Addressing Section 5. of the Office Action:

The claims are no more narrative in form than a great majority of the claims accepted by the USPTO in previous patents (See patents cited). What language, specifically, is indefinite? Examples? What language, specifically, is purely functional? Examples? What language, specifically, is operational? Examples?

In considering the patents cited as previous art, the application of this invention is more descriptive than most with greater detail and attention paid to organizing and correlating structures to present a complete device. (See specification and figures.)

The claims are in one sentence form, (see Claims, pages 37-40).

Lexicography. What terms are of uncommon definition or contrary to their ordinary meaning(s)? Examples? To what terms are Ms. Semunegus referring?

Addressing Section 6. of the Office Action:

The terms mentioned are part of the claimed invention. The limitations would not be included if they did not constitute a part of the claimed invention.

Addressing Section 7. of the Office Action:

The terms mentioned by Ms. Semunegus are descriptive to those who are skilled in aerodynamics and/or fluid dynamics, the arts to which the invention is most closely related. Further details of the invention may be included in an improvement patent.

Addressing Section 8. of the Office Action:

See figures 12a-b, pages 25-26 of the specification.

Conclusion

Addressing Section 9. of the Office Action:

There is no mention of the term "hexagonal cell," there is no mention of the term "substantially triangulated" in Melkuti "(5,454,53)". This is a poor interpretation of both Melkuti and the application under examination. Ms. Semunegus sees three fans in a triangle and leaps to conclusion. There is no hexagon in Melkuti and triangulation of structural elements is not mentioned in the specification, claims or drawn to in the figures. See Melkuti, See Application.


Addressing Section 10. of the Office Action:

The phone number given for Ms. Semunegus was no longer valid as she was no longer employed by the USPTO as examiner of this application. This was learned when I called Mr. Carone at the number given for him, on August 17th, 2005, after first attempting to contact Ms. Semunegus, to clarify issues regarding this communication. The USPTO did not inform me of this change in examiner, I had to find out for myself. I further learned that Mr. Carone was not familiar with my application, thereby eliminating my ability to clarify these issues. I was also informed at this time that my application had been reassigned to John Radi for examination, I was provided with Mr. Radi's phone number.

I phoned Mr. Radi on January 27th, 2006 at the number I was given, and was informed that he was not allowed to review my application until I answered the second office action. Who was I supposed to contact for clarification?

The date of this communication is stated as 7/20/2005, the mailing date of this communication was 8/12/2005, twenty-three (23) days between drafting and mailing.

Richard Tyler Frazer

 Feb. 8th 2006

Inventor: Patent Application Control # 10/642,554